

REMARKS

[0011] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10-13, 16, 18, 19, 24, 25, 27, 28, and 30-53 are currently pending
- No claims are canceled herein
- No claims are withdrawn herein
- Claims 1, 11, 19, 30, 33, and 36 are amended herein
- No claims are added herein

[0012] Support for the amendments to claims 1, 11, 19, 30, 33, and 36 is found in the specification at least at page 28, lines 8-25.

Cited Documents

[0013] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- *Kanevsky: Kanevsky et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,421,453
- *Oohara: Oohara et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,801,704
- *Hildreth: Hildreth et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 7,227,526
- *Kazama: Kazama et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,111,580
- *Dempski: Dempski et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 7,007,236

The Proposed Combinations Fail to Render Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10-13, 16, 18, 19, 24, 25, 27, 28, and 30-53 Unpatentable

[0014] Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10-13, 16, 18, 19, 24, 25, 27, 28, and 30-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 as being unpatentable. More particularly, claims 19, 24, 25, 30-33, and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Kanevsky. Claims 1, 5, 10-13, 16, 18, 27, 28, 34, 39-51, and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Kanevsky in view of Oohara. Claims 35-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Kanevsky in view of Hildreth. Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Kanevsky in view of Oohara, and further in view of Kazama. Finally, claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Kanevsky in view of Oohara, and further in view of Dempksi. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent Claim 19

[0015] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 19 is moot. Specifically, Kanevsky does not disclose the claimed, “executing the user command to effect manipulation of an object of the computer system based on the selection obtained from a user profile and on a particular application executing on the computer system.”

[0016] Claim 19 recites in part, “executing the user command to effect manipulation of an object of the computer system based on the selection obtained from a user profile and on a particular application executing on the computer system.” The Office cites Kanevsky, column 5, lines 10-16 as disclosing executing the user command to effect

manipulation of an object of the computer system based on the selection obtained from the user profile. (Office Action, page 2.) Kanevsky describes that:

The invention allows for the processing of multiple commands issued simultaneously from multiple users, the processing of the same command from multiple users where the command has a different meaning to each of the users, and the customization of a natural computer and/or service to the specific preferences of each user. (Kanevsky, column 10-17).

[0017] Thus, the cited portion of Kanevsky is silent regarding executing the user command to effect manipulation of an object of the computer system based on the selection obtained from a user profile and on a particular application executing on the computer system as recited in claim 19. Moreover, Applicant has searched Kanevsky in vain for such a disclosure, teaching, or suggestion. Instead, as described in the Abstract, Kanevsky is merely directed to a method of extracting gestures to recognize an individual.

[0018] Consequently, Kanevsky does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Moreover, the remaining cited documents (namely Oohara, Hildreth, Kazama, and DempSKI) alone and in the proposed combinations also fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the subject recital of claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the proposed combinations fail to render this claim unpatentable, and respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 7, 8, 10, 12-13, 16, 18, 24, 25, 27, 28, and 31-32, 34-35, and 37-53

[0019] For reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to independent claim 19, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 11, 30, 33, and 36 are also allowable

over the proposed combinations. Claims 5, 7, 8, 10, 12-13, 16, 18, 24, 25, 27, 28, and 31-32, 34-35, and 37-53 ultimately depend from independent claim 1, 11, 19, 30, 33, and 36. As discussed above, claims 1, 11, 19, 30, 33, and 36 are allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 5, 7, 8, 10, 12-13, 16, 18, 24, 25, 27, 28, and 31-32, 34-35, and 37-53 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Conclusion

[0020] Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Robert L. Villhard/
Robert L. Villhard (bob@leehayes.com; 509-944-4742)
Registration No. 53725

Dated: September 16, 2009

Reviewer/Supervisor: *Robert C. Peck (robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)*
Registration No. 56826